

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE**

---

MATTHEW PETRONE, and  
GREGORY ANDERSON, individually  
and on behalf of all others similarly  
situated,

Case No. 3:24-CV-00928

Plaintiffs,

Hon. William L. Campbell, Jr.

v.

METROPOLIS TECHNOLOGIES INC.,

Defendant.

---

***PETRONE PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSE TO  
ALHINDI ORDER RE: CONSOLIDATION (ECF. NO. 36)***

---

Plaintiffs Matthew Petrone and Gregory Anderson (“Plaintiffs”) and Brendan Appel (who filed a related case in the Central District of California – *Appel v. Metropolis Technologies, Inc.*, Case No. 2:24-cv-05477-SPG-MAR – that has since been dismissed with the intention of joining the *Petrone* matter) submit the foregoing response to the October 18, 2024 order in *Alhindi v. Metropolis Technologies, Inc.*, Case No. 3:24-cv-00748 (ECF. No. 36) (the “Order”). The Order directed the *Alhindi* Parties to “jointly file a notice stating whether they seek consolidation for all purposes, including class certification and trial, and whether Plaintiff Alhindi [would] file a single consolidated complaint with the [Petrone Plaintiffs].” ECF 36.

Counsel for Plaintiffs met and conferred with Plaintiff Alhindi’s counsel on October 29, 2024, and were informed that Plaintiff Alhindi would not seek consolidation for all purposes. It is also Plaintiffs’ understanding that Defendant does not believe a consolidated complaint is appropriate. Plaintiffs respectfully disagree and submit that consolidation for all purposes, and

filings of a consolidated complaint is appropriate. In particular, there are great efficiencies in consolidation for all purposes because the complaints in each case assert identical facts, the same cause of action [violation of the Driver's Privacy Protection Act, 1 U.S.C. § 2721, *et seq.* (“DPPA”)], and the proposed classes are identical. Failure to consolidate for all purposes would create significant inefficiencies. For example, Defendant has filed separate, but functionally identical, motions to dismiss the complaints in the cases. Resolution of the motions would require duplicative briefing that serves no purpose but to strain the Court's resources. To that end, Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court set a briefing schedule for Plaintiffs to file a motion to consolidate and a motion for appointment of interim class counsel.

Dated: October 31, 2024

Respectfully submitted,

**BURSOR & FISHER, P.A.**  
By: /s/ Philip L. Fraietta

Philip L. Fraietta\*  
Caroline C. Donovan\*  
1330 Avenue of the Americas, Fl 32  
New York, NY 10019  
Telephone: (646) 837-7150  
Facsimile: (212) 989-9163  
Email: pfraietta@bursor.com  
cdonovan@bursor.com

**BURSOR & FISHER, P.A.**  
Brittany S. Scott\*  
1990 North California Blvd., Suite 940  
Walnut Creek, CA 94596  
Telephone: (925) 300-4455  
Facsimile: (925) 407-2700  
E-mail: bscott@bursor.com

**STRANCH, JENNINGS & GARVEY,  
PLLC**  
J. Gerard Stranch, IV (BPR 23045)  
The Freedom Center  
223 Rosa L. Parks Avenue, Suite 200

Nashville, TN 37203  
Telephone: (615) 254-8801  
Facsimile: (615) 255-5419  
Email: [gstranch@stranchlaw.com](mailto:gstranch@stranchlaw.com)

*\*pro hac vice*

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs*